



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,625	07/25/2001	Giovanni Traverso	Q65519	3452

7590 12/28/2004
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

NEGASH, KINFE MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2633

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/911,625

Applicant(s)

TRAVERSO, GIOVANNI

Examiner

Kinfe-Michael Negash

Art Unit

2633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the amendment of 8/12/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 10-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 11-11 are circular and do not further limit the claims they depend on.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the same value" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the concatenation byte value" in lines 4 and 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the frame alignment word" in lines 3-4 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the possible difference" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2633

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the same predetermined value" and "the concatenation byte in line 3 . There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the concatenation byte value" in lines 4 and 7 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Please review all the claims for similar problems.

With respect to claims 2 and 7, what is being suggested by the last two lines of the claims is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2633

6. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turban et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,475) combined with Yellin (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,090).

As the claims are best understood, Turban et al., in Figs. 1-2 show an apparatus for virtually concatenating optical channels in WDM networks and an apparatus for receiving a number of signal frames virtually concatenated in WDM networks (see column 1, lines 26-57; column 3, lines 15-23 and lines 45-64). Turban et al., do not specify a byte reserved for a concatenation flag. Yellin in Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 40-48 teach the use of a concatenation flag byte. Thus, since the use of concatenation flag byte is extremely well known in the art as demonstrated by Yellin, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include or reserve a concatenation flag byte and write the same value in each of the frames in order to differentiate the beginning and end of a frame. Thus, claims 6-7 and 10-11 are rejected.

As to the method of claims 1-5 and 8-9, since the above combination discloses an apparatus that is capable to perform the method, claims 1-5 and 8-9 are rejected in the same manner as in the above claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Blair et al., patents are cited for their teachings of flags in a frame in a similar field of endeavor.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kinfe-Michael Negash whose telephone number is (571)272-3027. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571)272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Kinfe-Michael Negash
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2633